GOLD PRODUCTION, SLAVE LABOR, AND STATE INTERVENTION IN PRECOLONIAL AKAN SOCIETIES:

A REPLY TO RAYMOND DUMETT

E. Terray

In an article published in *Economy and Society* (Terray 1974), I used the Abron kingdom of Gyaman to reexamine a widely debated problem among anthropologists and historians, the formation of states in precolonial West Africa. First, I challenged the simple and direct correlation established by numerous authors between the development of long-distance trade and the creation of states; if one were to believe these authors, the state's function would be to provide trade security; in return it would deduct from tradesmen's profits, through taxes and tolls, the resources necessary for its functioning. In fact, I then maintained, trade security does not require state intervention, for stateless societies are perfectly capable of providing this security themselves. Besides, certain states at least, more concerned about attracting traders than about imposing taxes on them,

Research in Economic Anthropology, Volume 5, pages 95-129
Copyright © 1983 by JAI Press Inc.
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.
ISBN: 0-89232-221-7

deduct no money whatsoever from their trading profits. I next tried to demonstrate that the sovereigns, and the chiefs subordinate to them, draw the essential part of their wealth from the surplus labor supplied by their slaves and that the role of long-distance trade is therefore above all to allow the realization of the surplus thus extorted. Using the example of Gyaman, I analyzed from this angle such sectors as gold mining and the transportation of merchandise and affirmed that the king and his lieutenants play a determining role in both these fields of activity, not because they assume any monopoly, but simply because they are the principal slaveowners in the country. Finally, I suggested that the proposed model could be applied to many other cases besides that of Gyaman and that, *mutatis mutandis*, it would be possible to analyze in the same way the economic and social foundations of the Asante kingdom and those of the great empires of medieval Sudan.

However, in an article published in Volume 2 of *Research in Economic Anthropology*, Raymond Dumett (1979) delivers a supposedly devastating critique of these hypotheses: according to him, nothing in the available sources and documents could substantiate them (pp. 43 and 47). Moreover, I am unfamiliar with the "standard primary sources" (p. 57) and "because [my] chronological time frame is unclear, much of [my] analysis seems vague, fragmentary and unconvincing" (p. 61). In particular, my description of the Abron case is either insufficient (p. 61) or inaccurate, and Binger and Tauxier are called to the rescue to point out my errors. In reality, if one were to believe Dumett, in Gyaman as elsewhere, gold mining is carried out within the framework of a lineage-based system by production units founded on kinship. These units group together free men and women; sometimes one finds slaves among them, but these are domestic slaves; they do not constitute a distinct labor power (pp. 45-6, 48, 64). Consequently it is through taxes, fines, duties, and tolls that the state obtains its revenue resources, and by its own involvement in trade. In particular, if the kings and chiefs appropriate a considerable portion of the gold mined by their subjects, it is because they exercise, on the authority of their ancestors and of the community, the right of eminent domain over ground resources; thus we would be very close to a "quasi-feudal" or "seigneurial" system (pp. 52-3). Using categories such as domestic slavery and feudalism, Dumett goes back to conceptual categories already used a half-century ago in Rattray's analyses.[1]

I would first of all like to express my gratitude to Raymond Dumett. He gives me the opportunity to take up again a hypothesis formulated over six years ago, to clarify it, and to supplement it. By considering the facts I presented to be insufficient, he encourages me to produce new ones. This is all I ask. From this point of view, his critique is stimulating, and I thank him for it. On the other hand, I would like to give him a friendly warning against using certain procedures that are under no circumstances likely to speed up the debate.

In the first place, before giving an opinion on a dossier, one should examine all of its pieces. My 1974 article, which Dumett takes as his exclusive target, was

only a first attempt at proposing the hypothesis summarized at the beginning of the present reply. Later I developed and, I believe, enriched my argument in two other articles (Terray 1975a and b), the second of these published in English. However, Dumett does not take this into account and does not even list these essays in his bibliography. Of course, if he had simply wanted to demonstrate that I had written a poor article, he was perfectly right to have limited himself to my 1974 attempt; if on the contrary his purpose was to criticize what he called my "hypothesis," he should have, it seems to me, taken into consideration all the writings in which I explain this hypothesis. If he had done so, he would have obtained at least a part of the clarification he asks of me concerning the history and the political organization of Gyaman;[2] he would also have noticed that I am not completely ignorant of the tax system in use in the Asante kingdom[3] and that the existence of tribute paid by Gyaman to Asantehene is not unknown to me.[4] Finally and above all, he would have avoided committing several obvious errors concerning the history of Gyaman, which I will come back to later.

But there is something even more serious at issue. Knowledge progresses through discussion, certainly; the discussion must, though, be honest. Dumett, however, at times attributes to his adversary proposals that the latter never put forth or distorts his theses to the point of making a caricature of them, or worse. To give two examples right off: Emmanuel Terray, he writes,

> makes a definite causal connection between the accumulation of state surplus and traditional gold mining which he then relates to an underlying "African mode of production." (Translated from French to English:) (The quotation marks are Dumett's) (p. 41)

However, neither the notion nor the expression "mode de production africain" are mine, and I quoted them only in order to contest them. They belong to Catherine Coquery.[5] I gladly leave to her the responsibility for them, considering as I do that there are in Africa multiple and diverse modes of production and that it is precisely the researcher's first task to analyze and make an inventory of them.

A little further on Dumett writes: "There is no evidence in the sources that deep shaft and reef gold-mining was monopolized by the state or that this type of mining was reserved in any monopolistic way for royal slaves as the Terray hypothesis maintains" (p. 47). In my text, in fact, I explicitly exclude any idea of such a monopoly:

> The appropriation of the mines by the King and the chiefs did not result, as against an over-popular belief among European travellers of the time, from some monopoly they possessed on the products of the subsoil, but from the fact that they alone had in their possession the human means necessary for such activity. . . . Being founded on slave labour, it naturally follows that the production of gold was dominated by the Abron with the greatest number of captives, that is by the king and the chiefs. (Terray 1974a: 328)

Further on we encounter other spurious attributions of the same sort; in my opinion their presence weakens Dumett's critique.

Finally, the rules of the game imply an impartial treatment of information. One does not accept or contest a document on the basis of whether it is favorable or opposed to the thesis defended. Dumett, however, is not irreproachable on this point. Most of the time, as we shall see, he simply passes over in silence the facts I produce in favor of my thesis. When he does refer to them, it is to immediately contest their veracity. For example, about a piece of information given by Dupuis on gold mining along the Ba river, he writes, "Since Dupuis did not visit the area in person, he relied on the word of an unnamed informant. . .such hearsay can hardly be taken as fact without corroboration from additional sources" (p. 62). This fine rigor would be more convincing if a few pages earlier Dumett hadn't attached a great deal of importance to a text by Bowdich in order to show that the Abron look for gold mainly on the earth's surface: "Accounts recorded by Bowdich in the early nineteenth century make it fairly clear that small surface holes were also the most common types of digging in Gyaman" (p. 45). Unfortunately Bowdich no more "visited the area in person," to use Dumett's own expression, than did Dupuis, and his informant is every bit as "unnamed" as was that of Dupuis. Logically Dumett should, therefore, either accept the two accounts or reject both of them; that he does not is proof that critical ardor is not always good counsel.

LONG-DISTANCE TRADE AND STATE REVENUES

But let's drop this petty bickering and get to the heart of the problem. In the first step of my analysis, I examined the relationship between the states of the area under consideration and long-distance trade. I posed the question of whether or not these states obtained their resources through taxing profits made by the agents of this trade. Basing my conclusions on facts gathered at the scene, I then affirmed that the Abron state imposes neither taxes nor tolls on the Dyula caravans travelling through its territory and attempted to explain the reasons for their abstention.[6] I suggested next that the Asante kingdom treat the groups who are its partners in the game of distant trading with identical consideration. Taking up the trumpets of the last judgment, Dumett then exclaims:

> Terray, of course, was completely wrong to deny that kings and chiefs could have derived a significant amount of surplus from control over external trade and long distance trade-routes. As Fynn notes, "Asante trade in general was a state enterprise under the management of the Gyasewaahene" (Fynn 1971:117). At its way stations the central government inspected goods, exacted customs duties and maintained control over the network of major roads which extended spoke-like from the hub at Kumasi. In almost direct refutation of what Terray supposes about virtually free and open access to trade in Asante, we learn from numerous sources that traders returning to Kumasi from the coast via the Volta River Route and from the north were

> expected to pay a toll on all goods in transit. (Bowdich 1819: 319-320, Rattray 1919: 111) (pp. 57-8).

Dumett did indeed misread me. First of all, it is of no use to oppose my thesis with the assertion—an excessive one, I might add[7]—made by Fynn. I myself write that in Asante "the king and the chiefs took an active part in commercial transactions" (1974: 322), but it is one thing to take part in commercial transactions and another to control them. However only the latter point is being questioned. In the second place, to which group should we attribute the title of "long-distance traders"? In my article I use this term expressly with regard to the Mande and Hausa traders who link Djenne, Tombouctou, or Kano to the markets situated on the northern periphery of the Asante empire: "In Asante itself the basic long-distance connections were maintained by Dyula and Hausa caravans" (1974: 322). In fact, these caravans travel up and down hundreds of kilometers in the course of expeditions lasting several months; they establish links between regions whose resources are profoundly different from one another; and, in the course of their travels, they cross the borders of numerous states. The activity of the traders who form these caravans should not be confused then with the activity of the Asante traders; whether the latter work for the benefit of the sovereign or not, they move almost uniquely within the territory stretching between Komoe, Gambaga, and the sea[8]; if they do happen to go beyond the limits of the empire, it is most often to go to zones—such as Assinie, Elmina, Accra—that are completely under its influence. Dumett, however, makes no distinction between these two groups. This is why his critique entirely misses its target. I write, "In the Asante kingdom some commercial transactions—of kola and captives—were certainly subject to taxes but these taxes solely affected the Asante partners in the transactions and not the aliens" (1974: 323). I therefore am not ignorant of the fact that the Asante state collects taxes on commercial transactions, but I maintain that these deductions pertain to Asante tradesmen exclusively. To support this I cite a statement made by the Asantehene Osei Bonsu, which Dumett refrains—and rightly so—from commenting upon.[9] Instead, he quotes two texts, one by Bowdich and the other by Rattray, which seem to him to constitute a "direct refutation" of my thesis (p. 58). Let us look at them. One will notice that, in both cases, the taxes mentioned are paid by the *Asante* tradesmen (Bowdich 1819: 319; Rattray 1929: 111). Rattray's informant even specifies: "There was not any tax on imports from the north" (Rattray 1929: 110-111). To refute effectively my hypothesis, Dumett should have produced facts showing that Dyula and Hausa are also subject to payments of the same sort. I am patiently waiting for him to furnish the required proof. In short, Dumett establishes clearly the fact that the Kumasi authorities control the domestic trade of the empire, and the Asante partners the long-distance commercial transactions. On the other hand, he is incapable of demonstrating that these authorities also control the Dyula and Hausa middlemen, who ensure the proper functioning of these trans-

actions, and that they are in a position to deduct a share, however minimal, from their profits; yet it is precisely this point that is in question.

Better still, if one were to make an overall appraisal of the transactions taking place between the Asante state on the one hand and its Dyula and Hausa representatives on the other, chances are that the scale would tip in favor of the latter. Actually, Dyula and Hausa are Moslems, and the spiritually inspired favors they are supposed to bestow upon the sovereign bring them substantial rewards. Let us turn to the passages in which Hutchison and Ramseyer describe, after an interval of half a century, the religious preparations made before the Asante army embarks on a campaign.[10] We shall assess the size of the transfers of wealth that accrue, on similar occasions, to the benefit of the *karamoko* and the *mallam*.

In a communication made in 1978 to the Africanists' Society, I tried to tackle, from a more general viewpoint, the problem of the relationship established in West Africa between political authority, whatever its nature, and long-distance trade. As a first step, it seems to me that we can distinguish, in this regard, two types of social formations. In the first type, trade appears as a secondary activity, a marginal aspect of social life. It may be a source of occasional profits, but its slowdown or interruption causes no serious crisis and does not alter in any depth the functioning of the society. This is the situation of many segmentary societies. Among the Lobi or the Gurunsi, for example, only the surplus is sold, there is no production for trade, and the markets are peripheral. This is also the situation of certain states that draw from war (in all its forms: military campaigns, raids) the essential part of the resources necessary for their survival as states. Sikasso, Gonja, and Dagomba after 1874 could be placed in the latter category. Whether they are segmentary or under state control, such formations do not hesitate to tax heavily foreign traders or even native ones who come within their reach, because in fact they expect only immediate and limited profits from trade. They practice what one might call a predatory strategy; for them tolls are but a peaceful form of pillaging.

In the second type of social formation, distant transactions play, in contrast, a decisive role because they permit the ruling oligarchy to realize the surplus labor it extorts from its subjects and its captives. It can thereby obtain manpower (again, captives), production or reproduction goods (iron, firearms), and especially prestige goods that are a material representation, for all eyes to see, of its social superiority. The states belonging to this second category bring into play, in regard to distant trading, an entirely different strategy. They try all possible means to promote trade and to attract traders to them; they rule out, therefore, anything that might discourage or alienate traders. Consequently, they impose no taxes or impose them only on their own nationals, systematically sparing foreigners. In my opinion, we can place in this second group Gyaman, Asante, and all the other Akan kingdoms, and also many other states. In my 1974 article, the declarations made by the Moroccan sharif Shabayni prompted me to add Tombouctou and Hausa to this list (Terray 1974: 323). I will also cite Buna and the

great city of Djenne at the time of Seku Amadu; Boutillier writes the following about Buna:

> Ce n'est pas par le moyen de taxes et d'impôts sur les operations commerciales ou de péages sur le transit des caravanes que le pouvoir politique utilise pour son profit l'existence de la cité marchande. . . . C'est indirectement que le pouvoir politique bénéficie de l'intense activité commerciale. (Boutillier 1971: 247)

As for Djenne, we have this account by René Caillié:

> Sego Ahmadou ne perçoit aucune rétribution sur les marchands qui viennent faire le commerce à Djenné. Les marchands étrangers établis dans le pays ainsi que les indigènes ne paient pas de droits, mais ils lui font quelquefois des cadeaux, ainsi qu'au commandant particulier de Djenné qui est parent du roi. (Caillié 1830, II: 207).

The attitude, then, of the Abron and Asante is not an isolated one; we come across it also in a goodly number of states whose origins and structures are very different from those of the Akan kingdoms. Consequently, the thesis that bases the wealth of states on the control they exercise over long-distance trade and the taxation of commercial profits created by these transactions must be seriously amended; such was the first point of my demonstration.

GOLD MINING IN GYAMAN

Let us now consider the problem of gold mining, which supplies Raymond Dumett with the essential part of his argument. I will first examine the case of Gyaman and then pose the question of whether or not the observations formulated in this case can be applied to other regions of West Africa.

Dumett rejects first of all the distinction made by me between two principal forms of mining: panning for alluvial gold deposited by streams flowing over gold-bearing ground and the digging of actual mines. He enumerates for his part three different mining modes: panning for alluvial gold, deep-shaft mining, and shallow-pit alluvial gold mining from dry surface deposits. He is undoubtedly right from a geological standpoint. However, there is a thin line between these last two modes. First of all, at what point does one start speaking of "deep-shaft" mining? Most of the mining that Dumett places under this heading are, he tells us, ten to twenty feet in depth (p. 46). To classify them as "deep" is necessarily the result of a somewhat arbitrary decision. Moreover, as Dumett himself writes:

> Much of the gold recovered from deep-shaft mining was from the softer sedimentary layers, siliceous layers or disintegrated portions of the reef formation rather than from the hardest reef or banket. In other words not all deep-shafts were concerned with mining from hard conglomerate or quartz reefs; work was often similar to that in the shallower alluvial diggings. (p. 47)

Let us say, right off, deep-shaft mining in Abron comes under this last category. Geological surveys carried out between 1949 and 1955 have not led to the discovery in the region of Bondoukou of actual gold-bearing reefs in the precise sense of the word, comparable to those found in the southern regions of Ghana. The veins discovered have a very low grade gold content, and what the shafts reach are beds or small veins of quartz, as well as conglomerates of "quartzy" gravel (Soulé de Lafont 1956: 129-134).

But above all, from the point of view of those most concerned, the mining agents, classifications based on geology are not necessarily the most relevant. Our Abron informants especially take into consideration the difficult and dangerous nature of the work, as well as its expected "productivity." Consequently they contrast surface labor—whether performed on the banks of a stream or in the relatively shallow pits or holes—with labor performed at the bottom of shafts. Obviously the latter is the more productive, especially in terms of nuggets, but it is also that which demands the greatest efforts: one must dig more, extract the ore, and crush it when it reaches the surface; the amount of muscular energy spent is therefore much greater. Moreover, the risk of cave-ins, nonexistent on the surface, are considerable in the shafts, because after a certain amount of time these become cone-shaped and timber work support is unknown. In short, in the eyes of the Abron whom we questioned—and of whom the oldest are still eye-witnesses—the presence of shafts marks a significant threshold and constitutes the technical foundation for the social division of labor among men, women's functions being in any case limited to panning.

However, we find among the Abron the tendency, already discerned by Rattray concerning the Asante (Rattray 1929: 44), to relegate the most tiring, dirtiest, and most perilous tasks to slaves. "The hardest work was done in the shaft," we are told, "and therefore was relegated to our slaves."[11] This explains the particular forms that the social division of labor takes in this sector. Contrary to what Dumett claims (p. 44), I do not assimilate the contrast free-labor/slave-labor to the contrast surface-labor/deep-shaft-labor; on the contrary, I expressly indicate that "The production of gold in both forms largely depended on the labour of captives since . . . washing gold-bearing sands also occupied a great number of them" (Terray 1974: 328). In other words, "at the surface" one encounters side-by-side slaves and free people, men and women (Terray 1974: 327); "underground," on the other hand, slaves form the essential part of the manpower used, precisely because the work there is harder and more dangerous. This situation is not the result of a deliberate set rule; it results somewhat naturally from the technical characteristics of the work and from the place assigned to slaves in society.

Finally, the exploitation of small veins, beds, and conglomerates is profitable only if a great number of workers are assigned to the job. Indeed it requires the drilling of numerous pits: prospect drilling in order to discover the deposit, developmental drilling in order to exploit and exhaust the vein. One might

therefore think that those capable of mobilizing a great number of slaves would preferably undertake such a venture, that is to say, especially the king and chiefs. For the time being, this is only a simple supposition. We shall see later if the available facts confirm it.

What is the dominant form of mining in Gyaman? Dumett entertains no doubts on this subject: "Accounts recorded by Bowdich in the early 19th century make it fairly clear that small surface holes were also the most common types of digging in Gyaman" (Bowdich 1819: 169) (p. 45).

In reality, the text by Bowdich quoted as a reference simply states, "It [Gyaman] is uncomparably the richest country in gold and small pits were described to me like those Mr Park saw at Shrondo." Let us turn to Park's work:

> We travelled about half a mile west of the town [Shrondo] when we came to a small meadow spot of about four or five acres extent, in which were several holes dug resembling wells. They were in general about ten or twelve feet deep; towards the middle of the meadow spot the holes were deepest and shallower towards the sides. Their number was about thirty, besides many old ones which had sunk down. Near the mouths of these pits were several other shallow pits, lined with clay, and full of rain water: between the mine pits and these wash pits laid several heaps of sandy gravel....I could see nothing peculiar in this gravel; some silicious pebbles as large as a pigeon's egg, pieces of white and reddish quartz, iron stone, and killow, and a soft friable yellow stone, which crumbled to pieces by the fingers, were the chief minerals that I could distinguish. (Park 1815, ed. Miller 1960: 1309).

I have two remarks about these texts. In the first place, Bowdich's text says nothing of the relative frequency of the types of exploitation used in Gyaman, and the conclusions Dumett draws from it seem to me a bit rash. Moreover, the pits described by Park are intended for the mining of alluvial gold: one removes from it sandy gravel that can immediately undergo washing; right under Park's eyes, a woman proceeds to do so (Park 1815, ed. Miller 160: 309-310). On the other hand, we will see that in the case of Gyaman, it is entirely uncertain whether this always holds true.

Indeed, thanks to Dupuis we have a much more precise description of the diverse modes of gold mining in Gyaman. Dupuis first describes the washing of gold along the banks of streams:

> The dust gold of Gyaman, which is collected by washing in the beds of torrents during the rains, the same as in Ashantee, Fantee and Ahanta, is also higher-coloured, cleaner and better than what is gathered in any other country. (Dupuis 1824, pt. II: LVII)

Then follow several lines that one will excuse me for lingering over a bit; indeed the fate Dumett reserves for them illustrates well the surprising casualness with which he sometimes treats not only primary sources, but the texts he criticizes. Here are the lines:

> On the banks of the Barra, a stream which rises near the large Moslem town of Kherabi and

> flows south into the Tando or Assinee river, the Gamans also wash for gold, and during the season of rain my informers relate, there is occupation for eight or ten thousand slaves for two months. (Dupuis 1824, pt. II: LVII)

Let us look now at Dumett's comments. He begins by writing:

> Another gold mining district which Terray uses to substantiate his case is Nsoko. . . . Terray's argument is weakened by the fact that after 1819 Nsoko was no longer under the control of the *Gyamanhene* but had been absorbed as a part of the Greater Asante Empire. (p. 62)

However, one might turn to my article: *nowhere is the name Nsoko mentioned*, and for an excellent reason: Nsoko, or rather Nsawkaw, at first independent, came under Asante control at the time of the conquest of Bono by Opoku Ware in 1722-1723; contrary to the affirmations made by Bowdich (1819: 170) and by Dupuis (1824, II: LII), Nsawkaw therefore was never placed under Gyaman's supervision, neither before 1819 nor after (Hani Nsawkaw Stool History IAS BA2).

In reality, it is Bowdich who evokes "the small pits in Soko" (1819: 320). As for the washing sites described by Dupuis, they are located "on the banks of the Barra," which is none other than the Ba. Recommitting the error already made by Wilks (1975: 435), Dumett apparently believes that the Soko mines and the Ba goldfields are one and the same; seeking to raise doubts about the information given us by Dupuis concerning the latter, he writes: "Since Dupuis did not visit the area [Nsoko] in person, such hearsay can hardly be taken as fact. . . . But Nsoko was under the control of Asante, not Gyaman for at least part of the period covered by the essay" (p. 62).

However, these two sites, Nsawkaw and the Ba valley, are perfectly distinct from each other. The former lies to the east of Bondoukou; as for the Ba, it has its source not far from Yakase, to the south of Bondoukou, it flows near Asuefri and Transua, turning off towards the west to empty into Komoe; the area it waters includes in fact numerous deposits and has always been a part of Gyaman. The error committed by Dumett is therefore evident, and nothing in the texts can justify it. Let us turn to the litigious passage; in it Dupuis does not claim that the gold-bearing deposits of which he speaks are located on "Soko" territory.

Finally Dumett declares with fine self-assurance:

> Similarly, close examination shows that Terray relies almost entirely on the words of a single source, Joseph Dupuis, British Consul to Kumasi in 1820, for the core of his thesis concerning the use of thousands of royal slaves in deep-level reef gold mining in Gyaman. [But] we know nothing about the types of slaves which are described. . . and most glaring, Terray shifts his evidence since Dupuis was referring to people on the banks of the Ba panning for alluvial gold, not to the kind of deep level reef mining that would be necessary to sustain his hypothesis. (p. 62)

Once again, let us turn to my article. In reality, I use Dupuis' text only in order to show that many slaves, whatever their status, also participate in the washing of

gold-bearing sands. Before quoting it, I write in fact: "More generally, the production of gold in both forms largely depended on the labor of captives, since, once more by Dupuis' testimony, washing gold-bearing sands also occupied a great number of them" (Terray 1974: 328). Where then is the shift in meaning denounced by Dumett?

Let us look once again at the information given by Dupuis concerning gold mining in Gyaman. Besides the washing of goldbearing sands, he cites another type of exploitation:

> Gaman, and particularly its provinces of Ponin, Safoy and Showy, contain the richest gold mines known to my informers, in this or any other part of Africa; who, by way of illustration say that in Ashantee, Dinkra and Wassau, the veins of metal are found at the depth of twelve cubits (twenty-two feet) below the surface, but in these Gaman provinces at five (nine feet). . . .The gold from these parts, according to specimens which were shown to me, is of a very deep colour, mixed with red gravel and pieces of white granite. It all falls under the denomination of rock gold, and is considered of more intrinsic value than that of Ashantee, although the latter, as it passes for current, is mostly pure. The gold of Gaman, i.e. the pit gold, is sometimes brought to the Ashantee markets in solid lumps, imbedded in loam and rock, which together would probably weigh fourteen or fifteen pounds troy, and of pure metal might possibly yield, if separated from the dross, about one pound or one pound and a half. (Dupuis 1824, Pt II: LVI-LVII)

The mention of "veins of metal" and the description of the product show that it is a question here, not of alluvial gold, but at least of "quartzy" beds and conglomerates. The wealth and renown of Gyaman is due precisely to the fact that these are less deeply buried in the ground than elsewhere; they can be reached by way of relatively small pits.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, then, the modes of mining represented in Gyaman are diverse; it is not possible, as Dumett would have it, to give greater importance to only one of them. The information given by European visitors at the end of the century leads us to the same conclusion. In 1888, Treich-Laplène, travelling from Asikaso to Amanvi, observes along the way numerous streams "auprès desquelles on cherche de l'or": it is undoubtedly a question here of the treatment of sands gathered on the surface (Treich-Laplène 1896: 293-4). One can place in the same category the Surmakuru site seen by Braulot[12] and the zone stretching between Wam and Sikasue, visited by Delafosse in 1902.

> Toute la région parcourue aujourd'hui est couverte d'exploitations aurifères: les rivières sont remplies de trous, de canaux, de barrages. . . ces ouvrages sont surtout nombreux aux endroits où les chemins croisent les cours d'eau. (Delafosse 1908: 96)

The mines and pits are described to us by Lonsdale, Monnier, and Delafosse:

> From Dadiasi, one day's journey south of Bontuku, to the Prah River gold is found in considerable quantities. The pits are at the outside 30 feet deep, the average depth being about

> twelve feet. In some places gold is found on or near the surface. Few nuggets appear to be found, dust washed from the gravel quartz being the usual find. (Lonsdale)[13]

> L'or (se trouve) soit dans le lit des ruisseaux, soit dans les bancs de quartz. C'est une minéralisation très particulière. Point de filons réguliers, mais des dépôts dispersés, ce que le mineur de Californie appelle des poches. . . . Les noirs procèdent au jugé en forant des puits profonds de 4 à 5 mètres dont ils vont laver les déblais au marigot le plus proche, parfois à deux ou trois heures de marche. (Monnier 1894b: 422-3)

> Tous les villages traversés aujourd'hui. . . se livrent à l'industrie de l'or. La route serpente au milieu des puits, quelques-uns larges et pleins d'eau, d'autres étroits, bien cylindriques et profonds de 2 à 5 mètres. (Delafosse 1908: 90).

Finally in 1897 Clozel discovers much larger pits to the north of Matemangwa: "Pendant les deux premières heures de marche, de nombreux puits à or, profonds de 10 à 20 mètres sur un mètre de diamètre, affleurent le sentier d'une façon vraiment inquiétante" (Clozel 1906: 53-4).

The inventory of traditional production sites established in 1956 by Soulé de Lafont confirms the feeling of diversity produced by these documents: in it, the author distinguishes "les grattages dans les marigots" and the "zones de puits." The Kinkwa zone, for example, includes "une cinquantaine de puits d'une profondeur variant de 1 à 10 mètres" (Soulé de Lafont 1956: 132). In short, nothing permits us to claim, as Dumett does, that the shallow-pit mines represent the most widely used type of exploitation.

One comment, however: the observers at the beginning of the twentieth century note that the miners do not bother to crush the quartz but simply content themselves with collecting the powder. Here, for example, is Delafosse's account of the northern borders of Asikaso:

> Ici les indigènes n'exploitent que la terre; le quartz est laissé de côté; il est probable que ce quartz, qui forme des amas considérables, renferme au moins autant d'or que la terre dont il a été extrait; mais trouvant suffisamment d'or dans la terre pour satisfaire leurs besoins, les indigènes estiment à bon droit qu'ils auraient tort de dépenser leur temps et leur peine à concasser des pierres, alors que le sable est riche en métal et qu'il suffit de le laver. (Delafosse 1908: 90)

Similarly, Benquey, who reports seeing pits more than seven to eight meters deep, affirms that only alluvial gold is exploited (Benquey 1906: 160). In fact, this is a recent development, linked to the competition with mining from a new and much more profitable activity, rubber collecting. In Abron country this activity starts around 1890 and brings about either the abandonment of certain goldfields or at least a dropping of the most exhausting tasks, such as crushing.[14]

Now what is the social organization of labor? I completely agree with Dumett in believing that an important part of the production is provided by work teams based on kinship, at least for washing the gold-bearing sands and working surface mines. In my 1974 paper I wrote:

> In the first place the inhabitants of the country filtered the sands deposited by the water courses flowing over gold bearing ground by a method similar to the water-trough. That was a simple method. . . the head of every family could therefore practise it with the help of his immediate dependants; this is why along the gold-bearing rivers captives of the king and his chiefs worked side by side with free Abron and Kulango men and their wives. (Terray 1974: 327)

However, it seems to me that Dumett is mistaken when he states:

> Since a head of household would normally have several wives and many children living under his care (including nephews and nieces under the matrilineal system), a sizeable team of workers could be fielded as a part of the family. (p. 45)

In Abron country, in fact, if filiation is matrilineal, residency is patrilocal, at least for men. The nephews therefore do not reside with their uncle and do not work with him. Generally speaking the relationship between uncle and nephew in Akan societies is tinged with a veiled distrust that does not allow such cooperation. Describing gold mining in Manso-Nkwanta, Arhin indicates, for example:

> Men went gold-digging with their wife or wives and unmarried sons and daughters. . . . Gold mining required secrecy since a man might want to keep the bigger nuggets, *sika po*, which should be delivered to the Manso-Nkwantahene who sent them to the Asantehene. . . . Men did not go mining with nephews or nieces. Although the latter were the heirs, it was suspected probably for that reason that they might betray an uncle who kept nuggets. (Arhin 1970: 107)

But for this, Dumett describes in a way that appears entirely acceptable to me what could be called the "family sector" of gold production. His error is in limiting himself to only this sector and claiming that it alone provides for the near totality of production. He writes about this: "There is very little evidence that the states engaged in any substantial way in production itself" (p. 45).

What is the case in reality? In regard to Gyaman, oral sources agree with written documents in showing that the king and the high-ranking chiefs engage directly and actively in the area of gold production. Of course this involvement does not come within the framework of the lineage system. In Abron country, one does not imagine the king or his chiefs going themselves to dig a pit or a shaft in the company of their children, the princes (*oheneba*). When these great figures decide to exploit a deposit, they send a certain number of their slaves to the site, flanked by some of their free dependents:

> When the king or chief learns that there is gold somewhere, he sends his captives to look for this gold and bring it back to him under the surveillance of his sons or servants. (Nana Kobenã Gboko, *kyeame* of the present *Gyamanhene*, Kikereni, 7 September 1970)

Our informants illustrate this affirmation with precise examples. We know for example that, in the beginning of the twentieth century, the *Gyamanhene* Kwadwo Adingra had a golden stool made for himself comparable to the Asante *Golden*

Stool, which brought upon him the furor of the *Asantehene* Osei Bonsu. However, we are told, it was at Siraude, to the northwest of Bondoukou, that the royal captives went to mine the gold necessary for its making.[15] The account by Monnier, who visited Abron country in the spring of 1892, confirms this information. After describing the miners' labor, he adds: "Ces noirs sont en général des captifs travaillant pour le compte d'un chef. Quelque médiocre que soit le rendement, l'affaire est excellente puisque la main-d'oeuvre ne coûte rien" (Monnier 1894b: 423). Elsewhere, in a text whose racist character is sadly obvious, he mentions the work of the women panners: "Cà et là, occupées à laver, pour le compte d'un chef, le quartz aurifère, quelques femmes, s'il est permis d'appliquer ce nom aux silhouettes fantomatiques des captives évoluant autour de nous dans la pénombre" (Monnier 1894: VIII).

The participation of the king and high-ranking chiefs in the mining industry is made easier by the fact that, unlike their subjects, they need no one's permission in order to exploit a deposit and are exempt throughout the entire territory from the fees that ordinary prospectors are obliged to pay to the land priests (Benquey in Clozel Villamur 1902: 208; Tauxier 1921: 307-8 and 337). We have proof of whether in fact they use this privilege thanks to an observation made by Braulot that I quoted in my 1974 article. Visiting Asikaso in 1893, he encounters in Surmakuru all the inhabitants of the village of Kandena busy washing gold-bearing sand; however, Kandena, which is located more than a hundred kilometers to the north of Surmakuru, was at that time the residence of *Fumasahene* Dua Yao, one of the four great commanders of the kingdom.[16] It is therefore the dependents of Dua Yao—his servants and captives—who came to mine gold in Asikaso.

The involvement of the king and high-ranking chiefs in gold production is then fairly difficult to refute. Are we able to estimate the scope of it? The history of the populating process provides us with interesting information on this matter. When the prospectors sent by the sovereign or by one of his lieutenants discover a very rich deposit, they inform their ruler. The latter sometimes abandons his former residence and settles on the site with his entire court and all of its dependents. Thus is created a new royal village or new "country town." Among the localities that, throughout the kingdom's history, have served as a capital to monarchs and high-ranking chiefs, many have been founded under these conditions. At the very beginning of Gyaman's existence, "Brafo" Adingra, the nephew of and heir to *Gyamanhene* Tan Date, left the royal village of Zanzan to look for gold. He found some about 30 kilometers farther south and settled in Yakase, which from a chronological standpoint was the second capital of the Abron State.[17] Herebo, where several sovereigns from the Zanzan segment lived, was founded under the same circumstances by the *Gyamanhene* Kofi Sono.[18] The villages of Sakoadu and Ahuitieso were also built by members of the royal lineage who came to mine gold in the surrounding area.[19] This also applies to Kwasindawa, the principal residence of the *Kyidomhene*, to Gyende, the home of

the first *adontenhene* of the kingdom, to Kiendi, the seat of the *Nseniehene*, and finally to Kandena, already mentioned.[20] In each of these cases, the story is identical: a gold mine was opened by the king's or chief's men, and the ruler decided to come and settle on the site.

Most of the towns just enumerated were created during the second half of the eighteenth century. After this, other villages were founded by the king's or chief's prospectors, though the rulers did not deem it necessary to move once again. This is the case with Kwaekom and Fodia, built by *Siengihene*'s men,[21] with Deimba, built by *Gyasehene*'s men,[22] and so on. Based on this information, it appears difficult for us to regard the king's and "great" chief's involvement in gold production as a marginal phenomenon.

We do not know the way in which the kingdom's total production is divided between the "family sector" and the sector controlled by the king and his principal lieutenants. Nor do we know to what extent surface work and deep-shaft mining contribute to this production. But Dupuis gives us an important piece of information with regard to the latter. After reminding us that in Gyaman the "veins of metal" are closer to the surface than elsewhere, he writes: "The ore is dug principally out of large pits, which belonged to the late king, in the neighbourhoods of Briquanti and Kontosoo" (Dupuis 1824, Part II: LVI). The king mentioned here is the *Gyamanhene* Kwadwo Adingra, defeated in 1818. Moreover, according to the map drawn up by Dupuis, Briquanti and Kontosoo are located to the west of Bondoukou, between that town and the royal village of Herebo. This is in fact a zone in which goldfields abound, as Binger's observations testify, and also, more recently, those of Soulé de Lafont.[23] I had already quoted this text in my 1974 article. It allows us to believe, in fact, that in regard to mines *per se*, the king's role in production is, at least at this time, predominant. But, curiously, Dumett does not judge it necessary to comment upon this.

REVENUES OF THE STATE OF GYAMAN

To refute my hypothesis, Dumett put forward another argument that he seems to believe is decisive:

> Perhaps the strongest argument against the Terray hypothesis is that most kings and chiefs did not need to rely on their own personal cadres of state miners because numerous alternative means of appropriating gold and other goods and services lay open to them. (p. 48)

Except for booty, an occasional and uncertain resource, the means of substitution of which Dumett speaks are for the most part made up of dues and taxes. Dumett relies on Tauxier and Binger to draw up the following portrait:

> Louis Tauxier's *Le Noir de Bondoukou* (1921) which devotes considerable attention to land tenure relationships in Gyaman makes clear that the accumulated gold surplus of both local

> rulers as well as the *Gyamanhene* derived from what he describes as their fundamental rights of "eminent domain" over the land. Tauxier writes that Brong chiefs had the authority to demand one day's goldmining labor out of every seven from local inhabitants (again corvée, not slavery) and one-third share of total proceeds from stranger-miners. In addition the *Gyamanhene* had the right to all nuggets discovered by any persons—a privilege which could add up to a very lucrative source of revenue indeed (Tauxier 1921: 306-7). Judical fines and various taxes were apparently also collected in gold. And tribute was also collected in gold from subject states the amounts of which, although not measurable, undoubtedly contributed a sizeable portion of the gold in government coffers. (p. 62-63)

Four types of state revenue are listed here. I mentioned two of them in my 1974 article: the monopoly of the nuggets and the collecting of fines (Terray 1974: 327). I will examine the importance and the limits of these a little further on. Dumett then evokes "the tribute collected in gold from subject states"; unfortunately this exists only in his imagination. On this point, I questioned not only the present *Gyamanhene* and the great figures of the Abron kingdom, but also the Bona chiefs, the two *masa* dyula of Barabo, and the sovereign of Bini.[24] They all agree in saying that the Gyaman never imposed a tribute in gold on its vassals. At the most, certain villages were bound to give the king or Abron chief on whom they depended a certain amount of fish, game, or snails every year, when their environment was richly provided with these resources.[25] The enquiries by D. Groff in Asikaso, by J.P. Eschlimann in Bona country, and by J.L. Boutillier in Nasian[26] confirm this result, as do written sources. In this way, the Abron messengers who visited Accra in October 1881 listed the states under *Gyamanhene* Kwaku Agyeman's authority for their British hosts, but they soon added: "The Kings on the thrones of the Subkingdoms pay no tribute to the head king Ajeman and do not submit matters to him for consideration or instruction unless such matters be of great importance."[27] Dumett is not correct about the dues linked to the eminent domain over the grounds' resources. In fact, he indicates that the dues go to the "local rulers" or to the "Brong chiefs." There is here, if not a misinterpretation, at least an ambiguity that leaves the reader to suppose that these figures refer to revenues going to the state. In reality, there is nothing of the kind. One has only to examine Tauxier's text to be sure of it: the product of the seventh day's work and one-third of the gold extracted by foreigners are given either to the land priest (*sakotese*) kulango or to the Abron village chief (*odekurohene*), in the areas where the Abrons are the first occupants (Tauxier 1921: 306-8). However, the *sakotese* kulango belong to the population which the Abrons brought under their rule. As for the Abron village chiefs, they are designated by the members of the lineage who founded the locality, and it is also as land priests that they act on this occasion. Neither the one nor the other could be considered as government agents. Fieldwork confirms that they kept for themselves the gold they deducted as dues; this gold did not in any case fill the state coffers. Tauxier says so himself: The king "laisse la poudre d'or à ses sujets de race ou soumis" (Tauxier 1921: 337). As a matter of fact, as I indicated in my

article (Terray 1974: 327), the sovereign and high-ranking chiefs get their share only in very specific cases. Two conditions must be present: the gold must be extracted from a territory directly under their authority—the royal domain (*ahen efie*) for the *Gyamanhene*, the "province" for the chiefs—and it must be extracted by a miner coming from a locality outside this territory. Dues may then be exacted.

In Gyaman the territories of the royal domain and the provinces are discontinuous and entangled; therefore each of them includes a certain number of villages inside the gold-bearing zones. Gyaman nationals are rarely victims of this tax, which most of our informers do not even mention. Only the immigrants coming from outside the kingdom actually pay it.

Dumett also calls upon Binger, who is no more convincing. He writes:

> Les parents, amis ou captifs de la famille royale, tout en vivant un peu aux dépens d'Ardjoumani, se créent des ressources en or soit comme part de prise dans les razzias de captifs que fait de souverain sur les frontières de l'Achanti, soit dans la perception de l'impôt, qui doit se faire, comme chez tous les peuples noirs, d'une façon plus ou moins arbitraire. (Binger 1892, II: 179).

However, at the time when Binger wrote his great work in 1892, he had spent less than a month on Abron territory, from 2 December to 31 December 1888. Of this total, he stayed 16 days—from the 4th to the 20th of December 1888—in Bondoukou among the Dyula; and his stay in Amanvi with the sovereign lasted only 3 days, from the 21st to the 24th of December.[28] Consequently, the superficial and confused character of the information he reports is not surprising. The "razzias de captifs sur les frontières de l'Achanti" are in fact the campaigns organised by the Abron in 1876 against Berekum, in 1878 against Nkoranza and Wenchi, and in 1882 against Banda.[29] In 1888, these campaigns were a very recent phenomenon; the Abron could only launch them after the destruction of Kumasi by the English in 1874, the breaking-up of the Asante empire, and the emancipation of their own country. As for the tax, it involves a pure and simple mistake on Binger's part. All our sources agree in stating that the *Gyamanhene* never levied tax, if by tax one means the regular collecting of a duty for the state's benefit.[30] In all probability, the collectors indicated by Binger collected fines and not taxes. In Gyaman, what would most resemble a tax are the contributions that, *before 1874*, the chiefs demanded from their subjects in order to meet the Asante demands for tribute. But these contributions in fact only passed through their hands. They were remitted through the chiefs to the messengers of Asantehene, who deposited them in turn in the coffers of the Asante treasury.[31]

In short, among the several alternative revenues listed by Dumett, only nugget monopoly and fines contributed substantially to the wealth of the State. It could even happen that the monopoly could be broken by miners clever enough to hide their nuggets. Moreover, as we have shown in another article on the *Gyamanhene*

Adingra, the sovereign must show himself to be reasonable in the matter of fines; imposing them indiscriminately and under deceptive pretexts for the sole aim of filling the state coffers is to risk the desertion or revolt of his subjects (Terray 1975a: 447).

But above all, no matter how important the resources obtained from these two channels, they would not deter the king and the high-ranking chiefs from organizing gold mining for their own benefit. One must remember here the role that gold plays in Akan societies. It is much more than a tool for the exchange or conservation of value. In the eyes of the Akan, possession of gold is the tangible symbol of strength, rank, and power. The sovereign and the great figures of the kingdom nourish an insatiable passion for gold, which is only the reflection of their ambition and their desire for glory. To maintain or extend their authority and their influence, they need unceasingly to hoard new reserves of gold dust, unceasingly to increase the numbers and the splendor of their finery and their jewels. This is the price of having their names respected and kept in the memory of mankind. The competition of which gold is the stake involves them in unlimited accumulation. Therefore, they do not neglect any means at their disposal to obtain this yellow metal, which in their eyes is the greatest wealth and the most precious of belongings.

All in all, for Gyaman, the analyses just outlined lead us to the following conclusions:

- The king and the high-ranking chiefs are not content with deducting part of the gold mined by their subjects; they engage in production itself.
- This involvement is based above all on the use of slave labor; the king and the chiefs reserve certain deposits for themselves, having them exploited by their slaves under the surveillance of their sons and their free servants.
- The history of the populating process shows us that this involvement, far from being a marginal phenomenon, is accomplished on a large scale. At least for the gold extracted from pits, Dupuis' account allows us to think that the gold produced by royal slaves represents the greatest part of the total production.
- The fact that the king and the chiefs can obtain gold in several ways, through nugget monopoly, fines, and the like, does not deter them from engaging directly in production; involved in an unlimited accumulation process of the precious metal, they cannot ignore any means of getting possession of it.

Let us now see to what extent these conclusions can be extended to the neighboring regions of Gyaman and particularly to the sister societies of Akan country.

GOLD MINING IN THE AKAN STATES

First of all, let us note a remarkable fact. To our knowledge, it is at the beginning of the sixteenth century that information regarding the technical and social modes of gold extraction in the Akan country appears for the first time in written sources. Now this information widely confirms our hypothesis on the role played by the royal slaves in this field. In his *Description of Africa*, edited in 1506-1507, Valentim Fernandes draws quite a precise picture of the gold mines where the traders of Djenné go to stock up, and Mauny showed that this picture could be applied only to the gold-bearing deposits of the Akan forest (Mauny 1961: 359-360). Here is what Valentim Fernandes tells us:

> Les mines d'or sont au nombre de sept. Elles sont partagées entre sept rois dont chacun a la sienne. Les mines sont très profondément enfoncées dans le sol. Les rois ont des esclaves qu'ils mettent dans les mines, et ils leur donnent des femmes qu'ils emmènent avec eux, et ils engendrent et élèvent des enfants dans ces mines. Les rois leur y fournissent également le manger et le boire. (Fernandes 1938: 87)

Must this information be rejected? It suggests the existence of labor camps where the slaves assigned to gold mining were shut away. Now some archeologists have interpreted in this way the stone or mud ramparts they encountered, either in the present Lobi country—a possible destination of the traders mentioned by Valentim Fernandes—or in the southern regions of the eastern Ivory Coast and Ghana. With regard to the Akwatia site, to the northwest of Accra, Ozanne writes:

> It has been suggested that these enclosures were fortified strongholds built by the Akwamu in the 17th century to defend their northwestern border from Akyem, but this interpretation is improbable. The absence of tobacco-pipes and the typology of the pottery indicate an earlier date; and the structure is unusual for a fortification. Defensive works usually have the highest rampart inside the ditch, so that the garrison has a clear view, from the top of the bank, of the approaches. Sites like Akwatia look as if they were intended more to keep people inside than to prevent access, and it is most likely that they were labour-camps for the working of the rich alluvial gold deposits of the River Birim and its tributaries, designed to prevent slaves—and the precious gold dust—from leaving except under supervision. (Ozanne 1971: 48)

Paley-Parenko and the R.P. Hébert assign the same function to the works in the Lobi country, which were built up before the arrival of the present occupants of the country, and as a general rule are situated in the neighborhood of the former gold mines (Paley-Parenko Hébert 1962: 445; Labouret 1931: 17).

If these interpretations are correct, in their turn they suggest the existence of a relatively developed political power. We can hardly see how purely segmentary societies could ensure the construction, the peopling, and the surveillance of such "labor camps."

Later sources allow us, first of all, to establish that slave labor participates substantially in gold production. It certainly doesn't have the monopoly of it; alongside slaves, as Dumett indicates, we find free workers compelled to pay a tax; in certain regions and at certain times, the deposits are also exploited by means of "corvées" that the sovereign of the place imposes on his subjects. In the seventeenth century, it is undoubtedly a system of this kind that Pieter of Marees describes: "Chacun Roy a ses mines et y fait tirer l'or dehors par ses gens (zijn Volck).... La moitié de ce qu'ils trouvent est aux travailleurs et l'autre moitié au profit du Roi ou propriétaire de la mine" (De Marees 1605: 81) (78). But during the same period, numerous accounts justify the importance of the role of the slaves. As for the mines themselves, we have information supplied by Muller and by Tylleman. The former talks about the Accasseers, who undoubtedly come from Kaase, an area near the future Kumasi:

> Les Accasseer, prenant beaucoup de peines et de risques, font explorer les filons d'or dans les mines à une grande profondeur. Ils utilisent toutes sortes d'instruments, de grosses houes en fer, des paniers et des fortes cordes, non seulement pour creuser des marches et des galeries dans la terre, mais aussi pour retirer l'or qui a été trouvé. Ils racontent également que bien souvent un grande nombre d'esclaves disparaît dans un puits de mine du fait d'un éboulement. (Muller 1676: 272)

As for Tylleman, he gets his information from the "Akaniers" tradesmen who frequent the Danish fort of Accra:

> The gold is dug out of the soil by the slaves of these Acaniers.... When digging for it no notice is taken of any visible gold in the dug-up soil, but this soil is taken by the slaves in large wooden dishes and made into large heaps by the nearest water. (Tylleman 1697, trad.ang. 1904: 30)

The slaves, men and women, also participate in the panning of gold-bearing sands, especially on the shore; let us hear what Samuel Brun, Tylleman, and at a later date, Rømer have to say about this:

> Ils (les Africains) ont de nombreux esclaves qui cherchen de l'or dans le sable près de nos forteresses.... A un moment, j'ai trouvé bien cinquante esclaves au bord de la mer, qui recherchaient de l'or dans le sable. (Samuel Brun 1624, ed. 1913: 77-8)

> In the dominions of Fetu, Sabu and Commendo, several hundreds of slaves are often to be seen seeking for gold in a like manner down on the beach.... Tylleman 1697, trad. angl. 1904: 31)

> Au bord de la mer, d'après ce que j'ai pu constater, ce sont des femmes esclaves originaires d'Akim qui extraient l'or.... (Rømer 1760: 175)

During the following centuries, the slaves continue to represent a noticeable proportion of the manpower assigned to gold mines. So as not to multiply the

quotations, we will limit ourselves to three descriptions. The first we owe to Rømer; it concerns the Akyem gold mines: "Elles sont si riches," he writes, "que chaque travailleur doit livrer huit onces d'or par jour, ce qui est le minimum accepté par le maître" (Rømer 1760: 178). The mention of a master seems to indicate that the workers in question are slaves. In the nineteenth century, Cruikshank is more explicit:

> The principal supply of gold is received from the Ashantee traders. It is found generally in the soil of the country in small dust; but the bed of the rivers yield the largest quantities. There are also mines, where it is obtained mixed with red loam and gravel and pieces of white granite. Many slaves are employed in collecting it throughout the Ashantee country. (Cruikshank 1853, II: 278)

The same observation appears in Boyle's work:

> The Ashantees do not dig gold themselves, nor will they even pick up dust or coins that fall by accident, believing that such are jealously appropriated by the ground fetish, but they have no scruples in making slaves work for them. (Boyle 1874: 15)

Is it always really a question of slaves? Dumett rightly emphasizes that sometimes the Europeans mistakenly took people who were free workers submitted to corvée, for slaves (p. 52). Such a confusion could have been facilitated by the ambiguity of the twi word *akoa*, which nowadays is often translated as "slave," but more generally signified in the olden days "dependent" (Rattray 1929: 34). However, let us note that from the first half of the eighteenth century onwards and the conquests of Opoku Ware, the men from the North, whether they were captured in war or bought in the Buipe or Kaffaba markets, are more and more numerous among the slave population. They are easily recognizable by the marks they have on their faces; and they are denoted by a special term, *dunko*.

Another piece of evidence testifies in an indirect way to the role played by slave labor in gold production: the vicissitudes of slave trade. In the last 20 or 30 years of the fifteenth century, the Portugese reach the Gold Coast; because of their presence, the demand for gold suddenly increases noticeably. Almost immediately, the populations of the coast and inland become slave importers. The Portugese bring slaves from Benin, and at least a part of the landed slaves are taken inland.[33] Undoubtedly, they are not all directed towards the gold mines; in all likelihood, some of them are assigned to agricultural work and to transporting merchandise, although the seasonal character of these activities allow multiple combinations. It is tempting, however, to establish a link of cause and effect between the inflation that the demand for gold underwent and the development of slave importations.

Then, during almost one and a half centuries, the Europeans—the Portugese, then the Dutch—keep the Gold Coast out of the transatlantic slave trade: for they consider the traffic of "Piezas de India" incompatible with that of gold.[34] Be-

tween Assinie and Accra, slave trade starts only in the second half of the seventeenth century[35] whereas, at the same time, gold trade shows a pronounced decline.[36] Between the two phenomena, the relation is certainly complex. The slave hunt provokes the multiplication of wars, the closing of roads, insecurity; in this way, it creates an obstacle to the selling of gold. Moreover, it soon appears a more fruitful activity than gold mining, and the ruling elites abandon the latter for the former. But, as Rodney suggests, another factor was perhaps involved: part of the slave manpower, originally assigned to the gold mines, was able to be turned towards the slave vessels (Rodney 1969: 20, 22). In this way, it is not only trade, but also gold production itself that would have been hindered by the development of slave trade.[37]

In 1816, when the slave trade had just been forbidden by the British, such an assessment was made by the Dutch Governor Daendels:

> The slave trade has caused the trafficking of goods for gold and ivory to be greatly diminished. It has extinguished industry and not only caused a reduction in the number of gold-diggers, but also the regular work in the mines to cease in the dry season. (Daendels 1974: 250)

After the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, there is another boom in gold trading (Reynolds 1974: 70); but, from 1874, slave emancipation within the Gold Coast Colony provokes a new slide, at least if we are to believe Governor Maxwell. At a conference in Liverpool in 1896, he declares, "The export of gold dust from the Gold Coast had fallen off immensely since the abolition of slavery. The gold was there, but the free African would not work to amass wealth."[38]

Of course, other factors acted on production and gold trading, such as the states' politics and, above all, the competition that other activities judged more profitable by the Africans created for the gold mines, such as kola gathering and, from 1880, rubber. We will come back to these.

If slave labor plays such an important part in gold production, it is due to reasons already encountered in the case of Gyaman. In 1850, Gordon underlines "how very tedious is the operation of washing for gold" (Anonymous 1850: 79).[39] Many observers agree with him in insisting on the unrewarding character of the activity.[40] As for the work in the mines, it is as laborious as it is dangerous, and its result is uncertain. In a report transmitted in 1881, Hart writes, "The natives also sink wells for gold, varying in depth from 10 to 25 or 30 feet. . . . To search for gold in this way is most laborious."[41] On the other hand, the risks of mine collapse and of death by burial are considerable.[42] Quite often, it is only when they mention these risks that the European authors indicate the use of slave labor.[43] As for the uncertainty of the result, this is what Meredith has to say: "They (the Blacks) speak of working in the mines as an uncertain speculation, sometimes paying them well, at others not" (Meredith 1812: 121 note).[44] In short, the search for gold is work that is not very well esteemed: "It is allowed by

the natives to be a bad trade, and to be chiefly followed by those who are lame and advanced in years and unfit for more active employment" (Robertson 1819: 126). As much as possible, the free men unload the trouble of performing this task on their slaves. Questioned by Rattray in 1925, the "elders" of Domaa-Ahenkro explained this straight out: "We have now stopped gold-mining because it only pays when you have slaves" (Rattray, Fieldnotes MS 106: 2033).

But, Dumett will undoubtedly say, nothing yet proves that the sovereigns and the chief assigned a significant fraction of their slaves to gold production. So, let us turn toward the sources, because they alone are capable of bringing the debate to a conclusion. In the seventeenth and especially the eighteenth century, we have good evidence given the state of the relations between Africans and Europeans. In 1668, Dapper writes:

> On trouve de l'or non seulement dans les montagnes mais en certain temps la mer en jette sur le rivage même. . . . Mais ce n'est pas de là qu'on tire la plus grande quantité d'or, c'est des mines, qui ne sont connues ni du peuple, ni des étrangers. Les Rois seuls en sont les maîtres, ils y font travailler leurs esclaves, et font négotier cet or sur la Côte avec les Hollandais par d'autres Nègres. (Dapper 1688, éd. 1686: 293)

In the eighteenth century, we have the following account by Rømer concerning Akyem:

> Les Noirs nous ont assuré que Frempung, l'un des trois rois d'Akim, a possédé des mines d'or d'où chaque travailleur devait chaque jour extraire un pot de poudre d'or d'une contenance d'une demi-pinte environ. Dans de telles mines, on fait travailler les Noirs à une très grande profondeur ainsi que sur les parois latérales, et il n'est pas rare que cinquante à cent hommes s'y fassent enterrer vivants. (Rømer 1760: 178)

Regarding the Asante, Isert gives us some information; during his stay in Accra and its vicinity, between 1783 and 1787, he had the opportunity of meeting many Asante tradesmen. "On dit que le roi d'Assianthe possède un lingot si gros et si massif qu'il s'en sert en guise de siège. . . . Ce puissant roi entretient à ces mines un grand nombre d'esclaves qui doivent lui livrer chacun deux onces par jour" (Isert 1793: 216-7).

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Dutch Governor Daendels is even more categorical; denouncing the misdeeds of the slave trade, he adds, "Now digging for gold is practically only done by the slaves of Kings and Caboceers" (Daendels 1964: 250). For the first period, we leave the conclusion in the hands of two Ghanaian historians. Analysing the economy of the Akan societies as represented towards the end of the nineteenth century, Edward Reynolds writes: "Most gold bearing states owned some gold-mines that were worked principally by slave-labour" (Reynolds 1974: 21). Being more specifically interested in the Asante, Kwame Arhin arrives at the same results: "The State as well

as individuals undertook asikadi, gold-mining, either in the form of shaft digging or panning alluvial streams. State gold mining was undertaken with slave labour supervised by free subjects" (Arhin 1974: 19).

At the time, what was the part of this "state sector" in the total production? We obviously have no way of knowing. On the other hand, we may think it supplies an important proportion of their resources to the holders of the political power. Dumett in fact insists lengthily on the taxation system, thanks to which, if one were to believe him, the *Asantehene* could avoid involving themselves directly in gold production (pp. 57-9). But the chronology here must be taken into account. This taxation system does not appear in all its ramifications from the very beginning of the kingdom. Its implementation requires the creation of a complex administrative and financial set-up whose genesis is long and difficult. The efforts of Opoku Ware to set this up finally end as a failure, and it is only under the reign of Osei Kwadwo (1764-1777) that it takes shape and starts to function efficiently. Such is the meaning of the "Kwadwoan revolution" described by Wilks.[45] But up until this date, booty and the product of the labor of the royal slaves undoubtedly made up the essential part of the kingdom's revenue.

During the years 1818 and 1820, however, two changes occur. In the first place, as Wilks showed, the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 and the hostilities that oppose the Asantes to the English between 1807 and 1831 bring about a general reconversion of the Asante economy: from a commercial point of view, the Asante turn from now on toward the north in preference and particularly towards the Hausa merchants (Wilks 1971: 130-131; 1975: 262 sq.) However, the latter are above all buyers of kola; therefore, the kola production surpasses little by little that of gold. As a result, in certain areas at least, we witness manpower transfers. Assigned up until now to gold extraction, the slaves are now employed in the collecting and transportation of kola. This is what happens in the Bechem region, for example: "In the Bechem-Techimentia area, pawns and slaves, hitherto mainly employed in the gold mining industry, were now used in the kola trade" (Arhin 1965: 144).

However, this substitution of kola for gold does not fundamentally alter the existing relations of production. As I tried to show in my 1974 article, in regard to the social organisation of labor, quite narrow analogies exist between gold mining and kola collecting. In both cases, we see in fact the slaves doing a large part of the total work, and the chief occupying a privileged position in production and trade.[46]

But the abolition of the slave trade brings about a second consequence, because the slaves coming from the north can no longer be exported overseas. They crowd together in the Kumasi region, and soon their great numbers create difficult problems for the Asante government from a political as well as an economic point of view. To solve these problems, the authorities set up, from 1810, a vast policy of dispersion of slaves, who are driven back toward the empire's march and assigned to the colonization of areas up till then deserted. Commenting on

the promulgation of a law intended to repress the excesses of officials sent by the king, Bowdich writes:

> This law was particularly consolatory and beneficial to those slaves who, to prevent famine and insurrection, had been selected (from that fettered multitude which could no longer be driven off to the coast directly they arrived at the capital) to create plantations in the more remote and stubborn tracts; from which their labour was first to produce a proportionate supply to the household of their chief, and afterwards an existence for themselves. (Bowdich 1821a: 18)

This second innovation I did not mention in my 1974 article, and that is certainly the most serious of its insufficiencies. Since then, Ivor Wilk's great book and Norman Klein's research have shed light on this important event in Asante's economic and social history; from 1810 to 1820, "state slavery" disintegrates, while domestic slavery rapidly increases.[47]

Under these circumstances, by taking into consideration the factor of chronology, one could come up with the basis for a "compromise" between Dumett's theses and my own. The latter would describe an original form of organization that would reach full development in the eighteenth century; the former being the result of a later evolution produced by the abolition of slave trade and the serious problems it causes for the Asante rulers.

Two remarks must be added, however. First, the transformations analysed by Wilks and by Klein take place within the Asante kingdom, but it is not sure that they are extended at the same time to the whole of the Akan world. We have seen that Gyaman escapes them; in fact, the Asante invasion of 1818 inflicts upon it a veritable demographic drainage. Therefore, in Gyaman, this glutting of slave labor, which is at the origin of the Asante evolution, is not observed; on the contrary, from the 1820s, Gyaman tries to reconstitute its slave reserves by drawing upon its neighbors on the west—Dyimini, Gyamala, and Tagwana.[48] Other regions were also spared: in Sanwi, for example, if we were to believe Fleuriot de Langle's account, it is still the royal slaves who, in 1866, work the gold mines, to the sovereign's and chiefs' profit.

> Quelques chefs envoient des esclaves sur les lieux où l'on trouve l'or; ils doivent leur rapporter une charge fixée d'avance. Les orpailleuses du chef s'emparent de cette terre, lui impriment un mouvement très rapide, qui réunit au centre les paillettes d'or. (Fleuriot de Langle 1873; 398)

Moreover, since my article was principally concerned with the problem of the formation of states, it seems to me that its conclusions are not fundamentally questioned by what Wilks and Klein bring forward. The processes described by these two and the rapid expansion of domestic slavery in the nineteenth century are late phenomena compared to the genesis of the states. They come about at a time when the state structures are already fully developed. For the period of their

birth and consolidation, I have nothing to alter in my hypothesis of 1974, inasmuch as this hypothesis was not based only on the analysis of gold production. In my *Economy and Society* article, I also had insisted on the role of the royal slaves in the area of transportation (Terray 1974: 328-9), which Dumett does not mention. The following year, I emphasized their participation in agricultural work—it is for them to ensure the living of the king and the chiefs (Terray 1975a: 422; 1975b: 122)—and on this point, I note that Dumett agrees with me (p. 59).

Under these circumstances, and within the chronological limits just specified, I still conclude that there exists a mode of production based on slave labor within the Akan social formations of the precolonial era. Of course, this mode is not the only one present, as it combines with other forms of extortion of surplus labour—booty, corvées, taxation, tributes—to form the social and economic basis of the Akan States; but I persist in thinking that this will remain undecipherable if we refuse to take into consideration, in advance, this use of slaves, which is definitely one of its main components.

One last observation: in 1974, I wondered if the validity of my hypothesis did not extend beyond the limits of the Akan world. I recalled that, in the empires of medieval Sudan, productions as important as salt and copper depended also on recourse to slave labor (Terray 1974: 339). Without lingering on this point, I would like to produce some more evidence in favor of a generalization of the theses I have just described. Studying the lot of the royal lineage captives in Buna, Jean-Louis Boutillier writes:

> De nombreux captifs et descendants de captifs étaient employés sur les champs de leurs maîtres. . . .Mais les captifs étaient aussi employés dans d'autres secteurs de l'économie; en particulier leur rôle dans la production de l'or a été très important dès le commencement de la dynastie, production dont on a souligné qu'elle a été un élément moteur dans le développement du royaume. Tant le creusement de puits dans les zones aurifères que les opérations de lavage des sables contenant la poudre du métal précieux nécessitaient une main-d'oeuvre assez abondante: généralement en période de saison des pluies, favorable pour l'approvisionnement en eau, des groupes formés en grande partie de captifs étaient envoyés sur les placers de la région; installés dans des campements pour plusieurs mois, ils étaient employés aux diverses taches d'extraction de l'or pour le profit de leurs maîtres. Enfin à temps partiel, des captifs étaient utilisés soit comme porteurs. . .soit dans certaines activités artisanales comme le tissage. (Boutillier 1975: 260-261)

Thus we have here a very similar situation to that which prevailed in Gyaman. It is true that Buna is situated on the edge of the Akan world. Other cases present more significant analogies. Visiting Kankan in 1827, not far from the gold-bearing region of Bure, René Caillié shows that slaves played a major role in the exploitation of the region.

> Le pays de Bouré, me dirent les Mandingues qui l'avaient visité, est couvert de petites montagnes; il s'y trouve beaucoup de mines d'or très abondantes. Les naturels qui journellement les exploitent n'en connaissent pas la richesse. Des esclaves sont continuellement occupés à tirer les terres; ils emploient à cet usage des paniers faits avec des branches d'arbe; les femmes lavent cette terre dans des calebasses. (Caillié 1830, I:417-8)

Moreover, the sovereign of the country draws his resources as much from the surplus labor supplied by his own slaves as from the dues paid by his subjects:

> Ce pays est habité par des Dhialonkés en partie idolâtres; ils ont un chef absolu qui a la réputation d'être un grand guerrier; il a beaucoup d'esclaves employés à l'exploitation des mines; outre la grande quantité d'or que ses ouvriers lui procurent, chaque propriétaire qui fait travailler aux fouilles est obligé de lui donner la moitié du produit de la journée. (Caillié 1830, I: 419).

Such information is not sufficient for solving the problem posed, but neither should it be excluded without an in-depth analysis of all the facts.

CONCEPTS AND METHODS

In conclusion, I would like to bring up two questions—one relating to the concept of the dominant mode of production, which in some respects is at the heart of the proceedings Dumett institutes against me, the other relating to the methodological rules that I see fit to observe in the treatment of secondary sources of African history. In his article, Dumett sometimes seems ready to concede that occasionally the sovereigns and chiefs engage directly in gold production, assigning part of their slaves to the exploitation of the mines (pp. 56, 63). But, just afterwards, he tries to show that this is a marginal phenomenon. My main mistake, in his eyes, is to have asserted that in the social formations of the Akan world, slave labor for the king's and chiefs' profit constituted the dominant mode of production. To refute this thesis, he tries to establish that the slaves, and particularly the royal slaves, form only a small part of the manpower employed in gold mining and that the major part of the production is done by free workers. I hope I have made the insufficiencies and weaknesses of his demonstration evident; but even if he had conducted it in a conclusive manner, he would not necessarily have succeeded in proving, in all rigour, the falseness of my hypothesis.

Here we must come back to what the domination of one mode of production over another signifies in Marxist theory. When a mode of production is indeed represented within a social formation, the problem of finding out if it is dominant or not is not greatly a question of figures or comparative statistics. To say that a mode of production is dominant is not to claim that it organizes the majority of the available manpower or that the largest part of the total production is carried out within this mode. For instance, in French agriculture, the strictly capitalist sector was, from both these points of view, for a very long time very much a minor force; it was nevertheless dominant compared to small trade production in that in price matters, for example, its interests governed the evolution of production as a whole. I would thus like to remind the reader of the definition I used to establish my hypothesis: domination of one mode of production over another exists when the functioning of the second is subservient to the demands of the first's reproduction.

In my articles of 1974 and 1975, I tried, in accordance with this definition, to show how the necessities of the reproduction of the slave mode of production determined and transformed the functioning of the other mode of production represented in the social formation. For this purpose, I put forward such facts as the central role of the military power and its consequences, the lightness of the tribute extorted from the free subjects, and so on. This is the argument Dumett should have refuted in order to destroy my hypothesis, whereas he does not even discuss it.

Regarding method, it seems to me that Dumett uses the secondary sources of African history in quite a careless manner at times, and particularly the works of amateur or professional historians who were the first to be interested in this history. The merit of these is great, and quite often our research would not be possible if they had not opened the path, questioning the last witnesses of the precolonial era or taking down disappearing traditions. This does not imply, however, that we should accord them our blind confidence; their works, like the primary sources, must be submitted to historical criticism.

Because he forgot this rule, Dumett at times takes doubtful or fabricated affirmations at their face value and reproduces them as if they were well-established truths. Here I allude to his unfortunate incursion into Gyaman history: in three pages, he accumulates a whole series of mistakes, of which I will list the most important, in order to avoid having his text serve in turn as a reference for future historians:

- The expression "The Dormaa people of Suman," which he uses to describe the founders of Gyaman (p. 60), is the result of a confusion. In fact, the three states of Dormaa, of Suma, and of Gyaman were built by three related but distinct dynasties, whose founders left the Akwamu kingdom together, in the first years of the seventeenth century.[49]
- The Nafana kingdom of Banda was not founded around 1450 (p. 39) nor at the beginning of the seventeenth century, as I mistakenly wrote in 1974. The Nafana left Dyimini and reached the Banda region under the guidance of Kralongo; the reign of his successor was brief, and the third *mgono* (sovereign) Sielongo contacted Osei Tuto through the famous Bafo Pim, future founder of Nkoranza (*Banda Stool History* IAS BA 1). The arrival of the Nafana in Banda thus could not have taken place before the second half of the seventeenth century.
- According to Dumett, "Bonduku, which became the central city of the realm, had been an important market town for the gold trade to the north long before the establishment of the Brong kingdom" (p. 60). It is nothing of the sort. Gyaman was founded in the last decades of the seventeenth century by fugitives who left the Abanpredease region—not far from present-day Bechem—after the victory of Osei Tutu over the Dormaa. As for the Bondoukou locality, it became a town and a market only after the arrival

of the Dyula refugees from Begho. Following internal conflicts, the reasons for which remain unclear, the old city was abandoned by its inhabitants and it was they who made the fortune of Boudoukou. Thus Boudoukou is heir to Begho in every way; now archaeology, like oral sources, allows us to situate the decline and the disappearance of Begho at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the following century. In other words, the formation of Gyaman and the development of Boudoukou are contemporary historical processes; we may think that there were mutual actions between them: each was encouraged by the other's progress.[50]

Finally, Dumett writes: "According to Agyeman, the height of Gyaman territorial power was probably reached during the reign of King Abo Kofi (c. 1720-1746). Yet most of Terray's data and analysis on state extraction of surplus from gold mining is drawn from the nineteenth century after the power of the central kingdom had contracted" (p. 61). This is a new mistake. In reality, at Abo's death, in 1739 or 1740, the Abrons occupied only a slim stretch of territory extending from north to south, which approximately followed the trace of the present frontier between the Ivory Coast and Ghana, from Soko to Transua. Towards the west, they had not yet gone beyond the line linking Boudoukou to Tanda. It is only after the Asante invasion of c. 1740 that, under the reign of the *Gyamanhene* Kofi Sono and Kofi Agyeman, they undertook the conquest of Kulango country. In this way they wanted both to draw back from their terrible Asante neighbors and also to get nearer to their Kong allies. So they destroyed the Kulango chiefdoms of Wolobidi, Kanõ Nagare, Kpana; seized the gold-bearing region of Siraude to the north-west of Boudoukou; placed the Asikaso, Bini, Barabo, and Nasian marches under their authority; and finally extended their territory to the banks of the Komoé.[51] At the beginning of the nineteenth century, this territory, far from being contracted, on the contrary reached maximum surface area.

The responsibility for these mistakes is partly incumbent upon me. Undoubtedly Dumett would have avoided making them if I had published all of the data collected in the field in 1967, 1968, 1970, and 1976. But their positive cause is obvious: when he considers the history of Gyaman, Dumett blindly refers to the books of Tauxier (1921) and Meyerowitz as well as Agyeman's article (1966). Now, Tauxier lived in Boudoukou for two years, but about the region's past, he was informed by only two people: the Dyula *imam* of the town and the *Kyidomhene* Kwam Kosonu. The insufficiencies of Meyerowitz' work are too well known for me to linger over them. Regarding Agyeman, his works are of much better quality; unfortunately, the reading of his 1964 thesis—of which the 1966 article, the only one used by Dumett, is but a brief summary—shows that he did not enquire in the Ivory area of old Gyaman. He questioned neither the *Gyamanhene* nor any of the four great commanders or their spokesmen. I would not dream of

reproaching him for this. At the time, the relations between Ivory Coast and Ghana (Agyeman's country) were very bad, and probably he simply could not stay in Ivory Coast. Dumett should have taken these limitations into consideration before giving his opinion of Gyaman's history, which he obviously did not know well, in such a categorical manner.

Let us stop this reply here. For my part, if it is necessary even to say it, I am ready to renounce my hypothesis, if I am shown that it is refuted by facts. It must, however, be judged on its true content and not on propositions that are foreign to it; above all, the data on which it is based must be taken into consideration and not be passed over in silence or given a distorted image. I am forced to show that Dumett's critique does not satisfy any of these conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Translated from the French by Barbara Oudiz

NOTES

1. On domestic slavery, see Rattray 1929: 33-46; on feudalism, ibid.: 75-76.
2. On history, see Terray 1975a and b, passim; on political organization, see Terray 1975b: 129-132.
3. Terray 1975a: 447-448.
4. Terray 1975a: 446; 1975b: 119.
5. Coquery 1969.
6. Terray 1974: 322. Regarding the absence of any toll collection in Gyaman, see Fieldnotes, Bondoukou, May 6, 1967; Welekei, May 10, 1967; Gumere, July 10, 1967; Tiedio, January 18, 1968.
7. Rattray details the privileges granted to the *Mamponhene*'s officials when they travelled to Salaga in order to sell kola. Now the Kumasi *Gyasewaahene* had no authority over them, and the very fact of their being privileged necessarily implies that there were nonprivileged sellers, as Rattray explicitly states (Rattray 1929; 109-111, 248).
8. On the limits of Asante travelling, see Bowdich 1819: 182; 1821b: 6; Dupuis 1824, Part II: XV, XC, CVII. Dupuis' statements according to which some Asante, whose position is not specified, travelled as far as Wagadugu and Segu are highly subject to doubt.
9. Dupuis 1824: 167.
10. Hutchison in Bowdich 1819: 393, 403; Ramseyer and Kuhne 1876: 432, 444.
11. Fieldnotes, Kikereni, September 7, 1970; see also Adania February 16, 1968.
12. Braulot's report, n.d. (1893), ANSOM Côte d'Ivoire III, 3.
13. Lonsdale's report, April 14/May 12, 1883, Parliamentary Papers 1883, Vol. XLVIII C. 3687.
14. In 1889, rubber was not yet collected in Gyaman (Lethbridge's report, March 4, 1889, P.R.O.C.O 879/28, Afr. West 354; Ewart to Colonial Secretary, February 7, 1889, ibid.). But in 1895, when Samori invaded Gyaman, he attacked the rubber traders (King of Gaman to Governor Maxwell, July 29, 1895, encl. 1 in Maxwell to Chamberlain, August 19, 1895, P.R.O.C.O. 879/40, Afr.West 465). On the giving up of gold mining for rubber collecting, see Chalret du Rieu's Report,

July 9, 1898, ANCI 1EE42; Monographie du Cercle de Bondoukou, 1911, ANCI 3Mi2; Cornet 1904; 14.

15. Fieldnotes, Tabagne, May 14, 1968; Kikereni, September 7, 1970.
16. Braulot's report, n.d. (1893), ANSOM Côte d'Ivoire III, 3.
17. Fieldnotes, Kikereni, March 21, 1967; Tabagne, May 14, 1968.
18. Ibid. May 14, 1968.
19. Ibid. Sakoadu, August 4, 1976; Ahuitieso, August 16, 1970.
20. Ibid. Kwasindawa, September 10, 1976; Gyende, May 17, 1968; Kiendi, September 7, 1970; Bondoukou May 5, 1967.
21. Ibid. Tiedio, January 19, 1968.
22. Ibid. Kwasikumã, August 3, 1970.
23. Binger 1892, II: 170; Soulé de Lafont 1956, map. p. 128.
24. Fieldnotes: Kun Aunzi, August 19, 1970; Ndakro, August 19, 1970; Sangei, August 5, 1970; Yerebodi August 5 and 6, 1970; Yakase Bini, August 20, 1970.
25. Ibid. Tangamuru, January 21, 1968.
26. D.Groff, ms. 1976: 25 sq; Eschlimann 1971: 211 note 3; n.d.: 91 sq; Boutillier, personal communication.
27. Information obtained from Gaman messengers, October 28, 1881, Parliamentary Papers 1882, vol. XLVI (3386, encl. 1 in n° 30).
28. These dates are given by Binger himself (Binger 1892, II: 156-192).
29. On these campaigns, see Agbodeka 1971: 87-91 and 96-97; Wilks 1975: 287-295; Terray 1978: 262-266.
30. Fieldnotes, Herebo, March 17, 1967; Gumere, July 10, 1967; Ahi, August 8, 1970.
31. On the way in which this tribute was collected, see Fieldnotes, Kikereni, August 21, 1970; July 28 and 29, 1976; Welekei, September 5, 1970 and September 11, 1976; see also Robertson 1819: 182.
32. See Cruikshank 1853, 11: 244; Reynolds 1974: 12.
33. On slave trading between Benin and Mina, see Eustache de la Fosse 1897: 184, 186; Pacheco Pereira 1956: 125-127, 135 and 139; on the sending of the imported slaves into the interior, see De Barros 1937: 125.
34. See Rodney 1969: 14; Van Dantzig 1970, 1: 128; Pieter de Marees 1605: 72; Reynolds 1974: 9.
35. See Davies 1958: 41 sq; Van Dantzig 1970, I: 131; Reynolds 1974: 9.
36. Ducasse in Roussier 1935: 11, 13; Barbot 1746: 167.
37. Reynolds 1974: 9.
38. *The Times*, July 2, 1896.
39. On the identity of the writer of these articles, see Cameron 1882: 784.
40. Isert 1793: 216; Hutton 1821 (1832): 306; Adams 1823: 48; Douchez 1839: 111; Allen 1874: 143.
41. Report of Hart, s.d., encl. 13 in n° 125, Rowe to Kimberley, 5 June 1881, Parliamentary Papers, 1881, Vol. LXV, Part II, C.3064.
42. Hutchinson 1858: 68-69; Burton 1863, II: 123; 1883: 161; Horton 1868: 138-9; MacDonald 1898: 114-5; d'Espagnat 1899: 114; Perrégaux 1906: 101-2; Joseph 1913: 374.
43. See for instance Muller 1676: 272; Dapper 1668 (1686): 294; Maurice 1874: 381.
44. See also Burton 1863, II: 123-124.
45. Wilks 1966: 216-217; 1967: 212 sq; see also Hagan 1971: 43-62.
46. See for instance Freeman 1898: 353; Arhin, 1979:9.
47. Wilks 1975: 707-709; Klein, ms.
48. Terray 1975a: 400.
49. Terray, forthcoming.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.

Abbreviations

ANCI	Archives Nationales de Côte d'Ivoire
ANSOM	Archives Nationales Section Outre-Mer
Ms	Manuscript
PROCO	Public Record Office, Colonial Office

ORAL SOURCES

Adania	Nana Tan Kwadwo, Adaniahene, Nana Yao Menzan
Ahuitieso	Nana Kwadwo Ankwa
Bondoukou	Nana Dua Kobenã, Fumasahene (+)
Gumere	Nana Kofi Kosonu, Kyidomhene (1967)
Gyende	Nana Kwasi Fieni, Adontenhene
Herebo	Nana Kofi Yeboa, Gyamanhene
Kiendi	Nana Kobenã Doro, Nseniehene
Kikereni	Nana Kobenã Gboko, kyeame
Kun Aunzi	Nana Kwadwo Ngetia, chief of Bona Asuadie
Kwasi kumã	Nana Kobenã Adom, Gyasehene
Kwasindawa	Nana Kofi Kosonu, Kyidomhene (1976)
Ndakro	Nana Tano Kwame, chief of Bona Abrade
Sakoadu	Nana Kofi Amagyena, oheneba, Nana Kobenã Badu
Sangei	Mama Watara, Sangei Masa, Ba Muhammad, imam of Sangei
Tabagne	Nana Atta Kwadwo, oheneba, Nana Kwadwo Dongo, safohene
Tangamuru	Nana Kofi Kereme
Tiedio	Nana Yao Agyeman Siengihene
Welekei	Nana Kobenã Tah, Penangohene (+), Nana Papa Sian
Yakase Bini	Seydu Dao, Binihene
Yerebodi	Ali Watara, Yerebodi masa.

REFERENCES

Adams, John (1823), *Remarks on the country extending from Cape Palmas to River Congo*. London.

Agbodeka, Francis (1971), *African Politics and British Policy in the Gold Coast 1868-1900*, Legon History Series. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Agyeman, E.A. (1964), *Gyaman: its relation with Ashanti 1740-1820*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Legon.

———(1966), "A note of the foundation of the kingdom of Gyaman," *Ghana Notes and Queries* No. 9: 36-39.

Allen, Marcus (1874), *The Gold Coast or a cruise in West African Waters*. London.

Anonyme (1850), "Reminiscences of the Gold Coast, extracts from notes taken during a tour of service in 1847-48," *Colburn's United Service Magazine* 3: 67-84.

Arhin, Kwame (1965), Market settlements in north western Ashanti; Kintampo." Pp. 135-155 in Jack Goody and Kwame Arhin (eds.), *Ashanti and the Northwest*, Supplement No. 1, Research Review, Institute of African Studies. Legon.

———(1970), "Succession and gold mining at Manso-Nkwanta," *Research Review* 6 (3): 101-109. Institute of African Studies.

———(1974), "State intervention in the Asante economy." Paper given on January 7, 1974, Institute of African Studies, Legon. Mimeographed.

———(1979), *West African traders in Ghana in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Legon History Series, London.

Barbot, John (1746), *A description of the Coast of North and South Guinea*, 2nd edition, London.

Benquey, Cap. (1902), "Coutumes des Abron." Pp. 191 sq in F. J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les Coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*. Paris.

———(1906), "Le Cercle de Bondoukou." Pp. 157-194 in Gouvernement Général de l'AOF, *La Côte d'Ivoire*. Corbeil.

Binger, Louis Gustave (1892), *Du Niger au Golfe de Guinée*. 2 vols. Paris.

Boutillier, Jean Louis (1971), "La cité marchande de Bouna dans l'ensemble économique ouest-africain précolonial." Pp. 240-252 in C. Meillassoux (ed.), *The development of indigenous trade and markets in West Africa*. Oxford: I.A.I.

———(1975), "Les trois esclaves de Bouna." Pp. 253-280 in C. Meillassoux (ed.), *L'esclavage en Afrique précoloniale*. Paris.

Bowdich T.E. (1819), *A mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashantee*. London.

———(1821a), *The British and French expeditions to Teemb*. Paris.

———(1821b), *An Essay on the Geography of North Western Africa*. Paris.

Boyle, Frederick (1874), *Through Fanteeland to Coomassie*. London.

Brun, Samuel (1624), *Schiffarten, welche er in etliche Länder und Insulen . . . gethan*, Basel. Published by *Linschoten Vereeniging*, Vol. VI, 1913.

Burton, Richard Francis (1863), *Wanderings in West Africa*. 2 vol. London.

———(1883), *To the Gold Coast for Gold*. 2 vol. London.

Caillie, René (1830), *Journal d'un voyage à Tombouctou et à Jenné*. 3 vol. Paris.

Cameron (1882), "The Goldfields of West Africa," *Journal of the Society of Arts* 3 (1541).

Clozel, F. J. (1906), *Dix ans à la Côte d'Ivoire*. Paris.

Coquery, Catherine (1969), "Recherches sur un mode de production africain," *La Pensée*, No. 144: 61-78.

Cornet, Lieutenant (1904), *Notes sur la Côte d'Ivoire*. Paris.

Cruikshank, Brodie (1853), *Eighteen years on the Gold Coast of Africa*. 2 vol. London.

Daendels, H.W. (1964), *Journal & Correspondence*, Part I, November 1815 to January 1817. Edited by E. Collins, Institute of African Studies, Legon.

Dapper, Olfert (1686), *Description de l'Afrique*, Amsterdam (1st ed. 1668).

Davies, K.C. (1958), *The Royal African Company*. London.

de Barros, Joaõ (1937), *De Asia*. Extracts published by G.R. Crone Hakluyt Society, second series, vol. 80: 102-147.

de la Fosse, Eustache (c. 1520), "Voyage à la Côte Occidentale d'Afrique." Pp. 174-201 in R. Fouché Delbosc (ed.), *Revue Hispanique* 4 (1897).

Delafosse, Maurice (1908), *Les frontières de la Côte d'Ivoire, de la Côte de l'Or et du Soudan*. Paris.

de Marees, Pieter (1605), *Description et récit historial du Riche Royaume d'Or de Guinée*. Amsterdam (1st ed. 1602).

Douchez, F. (1839), *Causeries sur la Côte de Guinée*. The Hague and Amsterdam.

Dumett, Raymond (1979), "Precolonial Goldmining and the State in the Akan region, with a critique of the Terray hypothesis." Pp. 37-38 in George Dalton (ed.), *Research in Economic Anthropology* 2.

Dupuis, Joseph (1824), *Journal of a Residence in Ashantee*. London.

d'Espagnat, Pierre (1899), *Jours de Guinée*. Paris.
Eschlimann, Jean Paul (1971), *Elue die chez les Agni Bona*, Annales de l'Université d'Abidjan, series F, tome III: 197-229.
n.d., Ms. *Les Agni Bona*.
Fernandes, Valentim (1938), *Description de la Côte d'Afrique*. Edited by P. de Cenival and Th. Monod. Paris.
Fleuriot de Langle, Amiral (1873), "Croisières à la Côte d'Afrique." Pp. 385-400 in *Le Tour du Monde*, 2e trim., vol. 36.
Freeman, Richard Austin (1898), *Travels and life in Ashanti and Jaman*. London.
Groff, David (1976), "Thesis on the growth of cash-crops plantations in Asikaso." Manuscript.
Hagan, George (1971), "Ashanti Bureaucracy." Pp. 43-62 in *Transactions of the Historical Society of Ghana* 12.
Horton, James Africanus (1868), *West African countries and people*. London.
Hutchinson, Thomas (1858), *Impressions of Western Africa*. London.
Isert, Paul (1793), *Voyage en Guinée et dans les Iles de Caraibes*. Paris.
Joseph, Gaston (1913), "Exploitation indigène de l'or en Côte d'Ivoire." Pp. 373-379 in *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, Year 1913*.
Labouret, Henri (1931), *Les tribus du rameau lobi*. Paris.
MacDonald, George (1898), *The Gold Coast, Past and Present*. London.
Mauny, Raymond (1961), *Tableau géographique de l'Ouest Africain au Moyen Age*. Dakar.
Maurice, Sir Frederic (1874), *The Ashantee war*. London.
Meredith, Henry (1812), *An account of the Gold Coast of Africa*. London.
Meyerowitz, Eva (1952), *Akan traditions of origin*. London.
———(1958), *The Akan of Ghana*. London.
Monnier, Marcel (1894), *France Noire*. Paris.
———(1894b), "Une jeune colonie, Côte d'Ivoire et Soudan Méridional," *Annales de Géographie* 3(12): 409-427.
Muller, Wilhelm (1676), *Die Africanische Landschafft Fetu*, Hambourg (1st ed. 1673).
Ozanne, Paul (1971), "Ghana." Pp. 36-63 in P.L. Shinnie (ed.), *The African Iron Age*. Oxford.
Parenko, Paley and J. Hebert (1962), "Une famille ethnique: les Gan, les Padoro, les Dorobe, les Komono," *Bulletin de l'IFAN*, series B, 24 (3-4): 414-448.
Park, Mungo (1815), *The Journal of a Mission to the interior of Africa in 1805*. Edited by R. Miller. London: Everyman's Library n° 205, 1960.
Pereira, Duarte Pacheco (1956), *Esmeraldo de Situ Orbis*. Edited by Raymond Mauny. Bissau.
Perregaux, E. (1906), "Chez les Achanti," *Bulletin de la Société Neuchateloise de Géographie* 17: 7-312.
Ramseyer, F.A. and J. Kuhne (1876), *Quatre ans chez les Achantis*. Paris: Neuchatel.
Rattray, R.S. (1929), *Ashanti Law and Constitution*. Oxford.
Reynolds, Edward (1974), *Trade and economic change on the Gold Coast 1807-1874*. Legon History Series London.
Robertson, G.A. (1819), *Notes on Africa*. London.
Rodney, Walter (1969), "Gold and Slaves on the Gold Coast," *Transactions of the Historical Society of Ghana* 10: 13-28.
Romer, Ludvig Ferdinand (1760), *Tilforladelig Efteretning om Kysten Guinea*. Copenhague. French translation by Mette Hess.
Roussier, Paul (1935), *L'établissement d'Issiny, 1687-1702*. Paris.
Soule de Lafont (1956), *Le Précambrien moyen et supérieur de Bondoukou*. Dakar.
Tauxier, Louis (1921), *Le Noir de Bondoukou*. Paris.
Terray, Emmanuel (1974), "Long distance exchange and the formation of the State," *Economy and Society* 3(3): 315-345.
———(1975a), "La Captivité dans le Royaume abron du Gyaman." Pp. 389-453 in c. Meillassoux (éd.), *L'esclavage en Afrique Précoloniale*. Paris.

———(1975b), "Class and class consciousness in the Abron Kingdom of Gyaman." Pp. 85-135 in M. Bloch (ed.), *Marxist Analyses and Social Anthropology*. London.
———(1978), "Kwaku Kosonu dit Pape." Pp. 257-291 in C.A. Julien (éd.) *Les Africains*, Vol. 7.
Treich-Laplene, Marcel (1896), "Journaux, rapports, lettres," *Revue de Géographie*, tome 38, Vol. 1: 293-297.
Tylleman, E. (1697), *Enlidenenfoldig beretning om det landskab Guinea*. Copenhague. English translation by Ove Jensen. *Journal of the African Society* 4(13) (1904): 1-31.
Van Dantzig, Albert (1970), *Les Hollandais et l'essor de l'Ashan et du Dahomey*. 2 vol. Mimeographed thesis, University of Paris Paris.
Wilks, Ivor (1966), "Aspects of bureaucratization in Ashanti in the 19th century," *Journal of African History* 7 (2): 215-232.
———(1967), "Ashanti government." Pp. 206-238 in D. Forde and P. Kaberry, *West African Kingdoms in the 19th century*. London.
———(1971), "Asante Policy towards the Hausa trade in the 19th century." Pp. 124-141 in C. Meillassoux (éd.), *The Development of Indigenous trade and markets in West Africa*. London.
———(1975), *Asante in the nineteenth century*. Cambridge.